

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Advers COMMISSIONER FUR PATENTS POR DAY 150 plan 22313-1450 www.upt.pp.

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/004,757	12/04/2001	David Green	J012.0100	8336
4	7590 07/02/2003			
H. John Rizvi			FXAMINER	
Gold & Rizvi, P.A. Suite 450			BOYD, JENNIFER A	
600 N. Pine Island Rd. Plantation, FL 33324			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/004,757	GREEN, DAVID			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Jennifer A Boyd	1771			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap					
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Edensions of teme may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after 50k (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is goodled above, the maximum statutory period will apply a will apply and in a statutory within the						
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04	December 2001 .				
2a)□	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ T	his action is non-final.				
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) 13-20 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
		or election requirement				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a)□ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.						
Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. 						
Attachment(s)						
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)			
J.S. Paterii and Trademark Office						

Art Unit: 1771

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - Claims 1 12, drawn to a method of making a rigid fabric sculpture, classified in class 264, subclass various.
 - Claims 13 20, drawn to a rigid fabric sculpture, classified in class 442, subclass
 103

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as spray coating individual clothing pieces and then assembling.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. During a telephone conversation with Mr. John Rizvi on June 18, 2003 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, claims 12 20. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1 12 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Art Unit: 1771

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- Claims 13, 15 and 18 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Parker (US 4.171.391).

Parker is directed to a method of preparing a composite sheet material (Title).

As to claims 13 and 18, Parker teaches a cloth that is coated with polyurethane (column 1, lines 27 - 34), equated to Applicant's "decorative resin". Parker teaches that the cloth can be used for clothing (column 1, lines 18 - 22) which are known to be three-dimensional materials.

As to claim 15, Parker teaches that the cloth can be used in clothing applications (column 1, lines 18 - 22).

As to claim 19, Parker teaches that the cloth can be used in clothing applications.

Clothing has a hollow interior so it can be worn.

As to claim 20, Parker teaches that the cloth coated with polyurethane can be sanded (column 1, lines 60 - 67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1771

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

 Claims 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Parker (US 4,171,391).

Although Parker does not explicitly teach the claimed properties of the polyurethane coating resin as being substantially clear as required by claim 14 and glossy as required by claim 17, it is reasonable to presume that polyurethane coating resin as being substantially clear as required by claim 14 and glossy as required by claim 17 is inherent to Parker. Support for said presumption is found in the use of like materials (i.e. polyurethane coating applied to a fabric) which would result in the claimed property. The burden is upon the Applicant to prove otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald* 205 USPQ 594. In addition, the presently claimed property of polyurethane coating resin as being substantially clear as required by claim 14 and glossy as required by claim 17 would obviously have been present once the Parker product is provided.

Note *In re Best*, 195 USPQ at 433, footnote 4 (CCPA 1977) as to providing of this rejection made above under 35 USC 102.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

 Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parker (US 4,171,391).

Parker teaches the claimed invention above, however, fails to disclose that the clothing

Art Unit: 1771

used in the invention is recycled from used clothing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use used clothing in the invention of Parker for environmental reasons such as reducing landfill waste.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer A Boyd whose telephone number is 703-305-7082. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday (8:30am - 6:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 703-308-2414. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Ma Juddock

Jennifer Boyd

June 19, 2003